

**Bhat, Narayan**

---

**From:** Michael Bazylenko [biochips@bigpond.net.au]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 16, 2009 4:30 AM  
**To:** Bhat, Narayan  
**Subject:** NOA for 10/566,482

Hello Mr Bhat,

I have received the NOA for this patent application and I appreciate your input in preparing it.

I have realised, however, that there is one inaccuracy in the first claim that I would like to correct. This inaccuracy had resulted from the corresponding inaccuracy in the description that would need to be corrected as well.

The substance of the inaccuracy is in the definition of the microcavity, which has now become a part of the first claim, hence the importance of the correct definition.

The microcavity was introduced in the description of the present invention via a reference to a fundamental paper on the subject (H. Yokoyama "Physics and device applications of optical microcavities" Science. Vol 256, April 1992, pp. 25-33).

It was stated in the description (paragraph 23) that the dimension of microcavity is *in the order of half wavelength of light*. This is inaccurate. It should read *in the order of wavelength of light*.

While there is a specific example of a microcavity described in the above paper that has the dimension of half wavelength of light, the correct definition of microcavity in general, as appears in the first sentence of the abstract, is the resonant cavity that *has dimension in the order of single wavelength*. I attached a copy of this paper for your convenience.

The changes to the patent claims and description required to rectify the above inaccuracy are very minor:

- delete word *half* from claim 1
- delete word *half* from paragraph 23 of the description

Please let me know if any formal action is required on my part (ie in addition to this email) to enable for the above two changes to be made before issuing and publishing the patent.

Best regards,

Michael Bazylenko

9/22/2009